

SUSSEX-AST 93/7-3
gr-qc/9307036
(July 1993)

Can the Gravitational Wave Background from Inflation be Detected Locally?

Andrew R. Liddle

*Astronomy Centre,
School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences,
University of Sussex,
Brighton BN1 9QH, U. K.*

Abstract

The Cosmic Background Explorer (COBE) detection of microwave background anisotropies may contain a component due to gravitational waves generated by inflation. It is shown that the gravitational waves from inflation might be seen using ‘beam-in-space’ detectors, but not the Laser Interferometer Gravity Wave Observatory (LIGO). The central conclusion, dependent only on weak assumptions regarding the physics of inflation, is a surprising one. The larger the component of the COBE signal due to gravitational waves, the *smaller* the expected local gravitational wave signal.

PACS numbers 98.80.Cq, 04.30.+x, 04.80.+z

One of the many interesting possibilities highlighted by the observation of cosmic microwave background anisotropies by the COBE satellite [1] is that the instrument may be directly seeing the influence of extremely long wavelength gravitational waves [2]. In general, the anisotropy seen can arise as a combination of two contributions, the first being gravitational waves and the second being genuine density perturbations in the matter distribution at the time that the microwave background radiation was released. A given cosmological theory predicts the relative significance of these in influencing the microwave background.

One of the favoured models for the origin of inhomogeneities is the inflationary paradigm [3], whereby the universe experienced a period of accelerated expansion in the distant past. This is the only means by which adiabatic density perturbations may be generated (rather than simply assumed to be pre-existing), and it is fair to say that detailed analysis [4] of the consequences of the COBE observation appear to favour the perturbations being adiabatic. Inflationary models also generate a stochastic spectrum of gravitational waves modes, both spectra extending typically from wavelengths of order centimeters (though the density perturbations on this sort of scale do not survive long) all the way up to sizes much greater than the present observable universe. The COBE measurement itself does not allow one to distinguish between the two contributions to the anisotropy. However, the scaling of the anisotropies with the angular resolution of observation is different for the two types of contribution. Two or more experiments operating on different angular scales (or a single one with a wide range of angular resolutions) can therefore attempt to resolve the two contributions, and it has been shown [5] that although this is not possible yet, it may become so with improved data in the near future.

Reproducing the COBE measurement provides for the first time an accurate normalization of the spectra for given inflationary models [6]. For a specific model, one therefore knows the entire gravitational wave spectrum, and so can address the question of whether or not this stochastic background might be detectable in proposed gravitational wave detectors. It might as well be said straight away that the constraints have tightened to such an extent that the case for the LIGO systems [7] currently under construction seeing this background is already hopeless. The discussion here shall therefore be directed primarily at the proposed ‘beam-in-space’ experiments [8]. The sensitivity of these in terms of dimensionless gravitational wave amplitude is likely if anything to be less than LIGO, but they probe considerably longer wavelengths where the anticipated signal is larger, and consequently one should be much more optimistic as to their utility in searching for the inflationary background.

The key conclusion of this paper is a surprising one — if gravitational waves are identified as a component of the COBE signal, then it becomes harder to detect them in our own solar system. Physically, this arises because gravitational waves can only be significant if the inflationary expansion is far from the de Sitter limit, implying a rapidly decreasing Hubble parameter. This conclusion, though not previously stated in as explicit a manner, is already apparent in studies which have restricted themselves to looking at particular classes of inflationary models such as power-law inflation [9]. Alternative studies made recently have been less clear on this point, for example [10] by assuming that the entire COBE result is due to gravitational waves and then not following through the implication that this will necessitate a rapidly decreasing Hubble parameter. This *Letter* aims to improve on this in

three ways. Firstly, the discussion shall be kept in general terms, without restriction to specific inflationary models or classes of models. Secondly, the models shall be normalized to COBE accounting for both contributions to the signal. Thirdly, a more exact treatment, based on the Hamilton–Jacobi formalism, is used to consider the evolution of the Hubble parameter from the time at which the modes relevant for the COBE normalization are generated up to the corresponding time for modes detectable by local experiments, taking proper account of the impending end of inflation.

While specific inflationary models abound in the literature, they can almost entirely be brought under the umbrella of *chaotic inflation* [11], the situation where inflation is driven by a single scalar field ϕ , the *inflaton*, evolving classically in a potential which may be freely chosen. Different inflation models correspond to different choices of this potential, and we restrict ourselves to models which can be described in this way. Inflation is formally defined as the condition that the (synchronous) scale factor $a(t)$ of the universe is accelerating, $\ddot{a} > 0$.

Utilizing the scalar field as a time variable, the equations of motion in Hamilton-Jacobi form are [12]

$$(H'(\phi))^2 - \frac{12\pi}{m_{Pl}^2} H^2(\phi) = -\frac{32\pi^2}{m_{Pl}^4} V(\phi), \quad (1)$$

$$\dot{\phi} = -\frac{m_{Pl}^2}{4\pi} H'(\phi), \quad (2)$$

where $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter, m_{Pl} is the Planck mass, dots are time derivatives and primes ϕ -derivatives. Throughout we take $\dot{\phi} > 0$. As an alternative to $V(\phi)$, one can specify models by a choice of $H(\phi)$, determining the corresponding $V(\phi)$ by differentiation. This is greatly advantageous, as the gravitational wave spectrum depends only on the behaviour of H and so can be dealt with directly. In general one cannot analytically find the $H(\phi)$ corresponding to a given $V(\phi)$, but for our purposes one has no need to.

It is convenient, following [6], to go yet one step further and define a quantity $\epsilon(\phi)$ as

$$\epsilon(\phi) = \frac{m_{Pl}^2}{4\pi} \left(\frac{H'(\phi)}{H(\phi)} \right)^2. \quad (3)$$

This function can be identified as measuring the validity of the so-called slow-roll approximation as inflation progresses [6]. Here we shall not need recourse to this property. Let us note though that an arbitrary inflation model can be specified by a choice of $\epsilon(\phi)$, with the corresponding $H(\phi)$ obtained by quadrature through

$$H(\phi) = H_{\text{end}} \exp \left(\int_{\phi}^{\phi_{\text{end}}} \sqrt{\frac{4\pi\epsilon(\phi)}{m_{Pl}^2}} d\phi \right), \quad (4)$$

where H_{end} is $H(\phi_{\text{end}})$, the Hubble parameter at the end of inflation. The condition for inflation, $\ddot{a} > 0$, is precisely equivalent to $\epsilon(\phi) < 1$. Hence ϕ_{end} is determined by the condition $\epsilon(\phi_{\text{end}}) = 1$.

Inflation generates both density perturbation (scalar) and gravitational wave (tensor) spectra. The calculations giving rise to these spectra are well known, and we shall simply

quote the results. The key characteristic of inflation is that a given *comoving* scale k (that is, one stretched with the expansion $a(t)$) grows in relation to the characteristic scale of the expansion, the comoving Hubble length H^{-1}/a . The scales of interest to us possess the following history. Sufficiently early in inflation a given comoving scale is well inside the Hubble length. As inflation proceeds, the scale is stretched beyond the Hubble length, at which point vacuum fluctuations in the scalar and gravitational wave modes are ‘frozen-in’, their amplitude remaining fixed. For the gravitational wave modes, this effect is commonly called parametric or superadiabatic amplification [13], and can be interpreted in quantum terms as the creation of gravitons. Much later after inflation, the modes re-enter the Hubble radius and give rise to observable consequences. On a given scale, the amplitude of the modes is determined by the physical conditions, and in particular the behaviour of the Hubble parameter, at the time they left the Hubble radius during inflation. The modes thus obey a ‘first out, last in’ structure, so that modes on larger scales were frozen-in earlier during inflation. The standard expressions for the spectra of scalar and tensor modes are [4]

$$\mathcal{P}_S^{1/2}(k) = \frac{2}{m_{Pl}^2} \frac{H^2(\phi)}{|H'(\phi)|} \Big|_{aH=k}, \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_T^{1/2}(k) = \frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{H(\phi)}{m_{Pl}} \Big|_{aH=k}, \quad (6)$$

where the evaluations are carried out when the comoving scale k crossed outside the Hubble radius.

The simplest quantity to compare with the experimental sensitivity of gravitational wave detectors is the present-day contribution per octave of the gravitational waves to the total energy density, given by [14]

$$\Omega_g(k) \simeq \frac{2}{3\pi} \left(\frac{H}{m_{Pl}} \right)^2 \times 4 \times 10^{-5} h^{-2}, \quad (7)$$

where H is evaluated as the scale k crosses outside the Hubble radius. The last factor accounts for redshifting during the matter-dominated era, and h is the present-day Hubble parameter in units of $100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, assumed to lie between 0.4 and 1. For LIGO the peak sensitivity is $\Omega_g \simeq 10^{-11}$ at 10 Hz [7], while the beam-in-space sensitivity peaks at $\Omega_g \simeq 10^{-16}$ at 10^{-4} Hz [8].

One needs to connect the comoving scale to the value of ϕ during inflation. This is carried out via the number of e -foldings $N(k)$ of expansion between scale k crossing the Hubble radius and the end of inflation, defined by $N(k) = \ln(a(k)/a_{\text{end}})$. For our purposes, the expression

$$N(k) = 60 - \ln \frac{k}{a_0 H_0}, \quad (8)$$

(‘0’ indicating present value) is easily adequate [4]; the value 60 depends on the reheating properties after inflation, but our final results have only a very weak dependence on it. The number of e -foldings between two scalar field values, the latter taken as ϕ_{end} , is given exactly by

$$N(\phi, \phi_{\text{end}}) = \sqrt{\frac{4\pi}{m_{Pl}^2}} \int_{\phi}^{\phi_{\text{end}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon(\phi)}} d\phi. \quad (9)$$

The comoving scale equal to the present Hubble radius, $1/a_0 H_0 = 3000 h^{-1}$ Mpc = $10^{28} h^{-1}$ cm, equalled the Hubble radius around 60 e -foldings before the end of inflation. The beam-in-space experiments are sensitive to much smaller scales, with peak sensitivity at wavelengths around 10^{14} centimeters; this scale crossed the Hubble radius 33 e -foldings later. The corresponding figure for the LIGO experiment is 44. In fact, for extreme model parameters the LIGO scales may never pass outside the Hubble radius during inflation, and the gravitational wave production there would be severely suppressed in accord with the adiabatic limit.

The COBE normalization fixes the integration constant which appears when one goes from $\epsilon(\phi)$ to $H(\phi)$. It is easiest to specify that integration constant as H_{60} , the value of H when the presently observable universe crossed outside the Hubble radius, rather than H_{end} . In cases where inflation is close to exponential, the standard COBE normalization is $\mathcal{P}_S^{1/2}(k = a_0 H_0) = 4.3 \times 10^{-5}$. [The quantity δ_H used in [4, 6] equals $(2/5)\mathcal{P}_S^{1/2}$.] However, if ϵ_{60} or ϵ'_{60} are noticeably different from unity then there are corrections which must be taken into account, and this is done in accord with the treatment in [6].

An important guide is an approximate analytic measure of the relative significance of the tensor and scalar contributions to large angle microwave background anisotropies. The relative contributions to the squared expectation Σ_l^2 of the l -th multipole of a spherical harmonic decomposition can be written as [4]

$$\frac{\Sigma_l^2(\text{tensor})}{\Sigma_l^2(\text{scalar})} \simeq \frac{25}{2} \epsilon(\phi_l), \quad (10)$$

where ϕ_l indicates evaluation when the scales predominantly contributing to the l -th multipole, $k = la_0 H_0/2$, crossed the Hubble radius during inflation. Consequently, tensor modes contribute significantly only if $\epsilon(\phi_l)$ is at least a few hundredths.

In bounding H_{60} , one finds the initially promising result that the largest values of H_{60} come from choosing a large ϵ_{60} . To ensure consistency of the calculational method, mild restrictions on deviations from slow-roll are made, as discussed in [6]; with these the largest COBE normalization of is $H_{60} = 2.9 \times 10^{-5} m_{Pl}$ occurring with $\epsilon_{60} = 0.25$, the maximum permitted. So the Hubble parameter is largest at 60 e -foldings in cases where the gravitational wave contribution is substantial. This somewhat surprising result occurs because of the effect of the dramatic deviations of the spectra from the usual scale-invariance on the normalization in this case [6]. This deviation has a detrimental effect on the anticipated local gravitational wave signal.

As the Hubble parameter can only decrease as the expansion continues, this sets a weak but absolute upper limit on Ω_g across all scales of

$$\Omega_g h^2 < 7 \times 10^{-15}, \quad (11)$$

which is well below the LIGO sensitivity but comfortably within that of the beam-in-space, especially for low h .

The next step is to implement some very weak assumptions regarding the nature of inflation. If one has a large gravitational wave contribution to COBE, one requires a large value of H' and consequently has a rapidly decreasing Hubble parameter. It would be possible for the Hubble parameter to sharply level off as soon as scales contributing to

COBE have crossed the Hubble radius; such ‘designer’ situations cannot be excluded on physical grounds, but are physically unappealing.

Because of the way the problem has been set up, inflation must end within 60 e -foldings. This requires that $\epsilon(\phi)$ must grow to unity, which will necessitate a reduction in H . The condition for 60 e -foldings is

$$\frac{60}{\sqrt{4\pi}} = \int_{\phi_{60}}^{\phi_{\text{end}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon(\phi)}} \frac{d\phi}{m_{Pl}}. \quad (12)$$

The reduction in H that occurs during the last 60 e -foldings subject to this constraint is

$$\frac{H_{\text{end}}}{H_{60}} = \exp \left(-\sqrt{4\pi} \int_{\phi_{60}}^{\phi_{\text{end}}} \sqrt{\epsilon(\phi)} \frac{d\phi}{m_{Pl}} \right), \quad (13)$$

where $\epsilon(\phi_{\text{end}}) = 1$ and H_{60} is determined from the COBE normalization for the given ϵ_{60} and ϵ'_{60} . For gravitational wave purposes, we are more interested in the reduction during the first 33 of these e -foldings, which get us down to the beam-in-space frequencies.

In order to gain meaningful results, one must impose some constraint on the inflationary models, which is intended to represent some sense of ‘physical reasonableness’. Such a notion is subject both to prejudice and to exceptions, and so it is in one’s interest to make as weak assumptions as one feels able to. The choice made here is to assume that $\epsilon(\phi)$ does not decrease during the last 60 e -foldings. In almost all models, $\epsilon(\phi)$ must rise to unity, and were one to choose a functionally complex $\epsilon(\phi)$ to violate this assumption then the underlying potential would be complex, threatening the prejudice that the potential belongs to a simple underlying theory. Further, almost all known models do fit into this assumption, including chaotic inflation with polynomial potentials [11], natural inflation [15] and power-law inflation [16]. It also includes models where inflation ends by an additional mechanism, and which thus don’t necessarily end at $\epsilon(\phi) = 1$, such as extended inflation [17]. Those rare known examples which do not fit this assumption, intermediate inflation [18] and some versions of models based on two scales [19], can be shown case by case to produce low local gravitational wave amplitudes unless extreme fine-tuning is introduced.

With this assumption, for a given ϵ_{60} one has

$$\frac{H_{27}}{H_{60}} \leq \exp(-33\epsilon_{60}), \quad (14)$$

where H_{27} is the Hubble parameter appropriate for beam-in-space scales, equality being achieved by retaining a constant $\epsilon(\phi)$ until 60 e -foldings pass and then increasing it rapidly to unity. The exponential factor indicates that choosing a large ϵ_{60} to maximize the gravitational wave contribution to COBE is not the best way to maximize the contribution on shorter scales. With H_{60} COBE normalized, the overall maximum value is found for $\epsilon_{60} \simeq 1/66$, giving rise to $H_{27}^{\text{max}} \simeq 5.5 \times 10^{-6} m_{Pl}$ supplying a ‘beam-in-space’ signal of

$$\Omega_g^{\text{max}} h^2 \simeq 2.4 \times 10^{-16}. \quad (15)$$

This is within the anticipated sensitivity, and so one concludes that at least within this rather general set of inflation models, it is possible to have consistency with COBE and be able to see a signal with beam-in-space.

Now suppose however that the COBE signal is identified as having a sizeable gravitational wave component. For example, the tentative results of [5] indicate roughly equal scalar and tensor contributions, implying $\epsilon_{60} \simeq 1/12$. In that case (numerically calculating the exact COBE normalization [6]) one finds $\Omega_g h^2 \leq 1.3 \times 10^{-17}$, out of reach of the beam-in-space. Only once the tensor contribution is less than half the scalar one is the prediction comfortably within the anticipated sensitivity.

For concreteness, let's end with the predictions of some specific COBE normalized models. Chaotic inflation models with $V(\phi) \propto \phi^\alpha$ (α an even integer) give very small gravitational wave contributions to COBE. Here the standard normalization and the slow-roll approximation are adequate and yield for the beam-in-space

$$\Omega_g h^2 = \frac{4.8 \times 10^{-14} \alpha}{240 + \alpha} \left(\frac{108 + \alpha}{240 + \alpha} \right)^{\alpha/2}, \quad (16)$$

$$= \begin{cases} 1.8 \times 10^{-16} & \text{for } \alpha = 2, \\ 1.7 \times 10^{-16} & \text{for } \alpha = 4. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

This is comfortably detectable and indeed not far from the optimal theoretical value. Power-law models $a(t) \propto t^p$ with high powers give results close to the optimal with negligible gravitational effect on COBE. But low powers, which give a large effect on COBE, invariably give smaller beam-in-space predictions. One can solve the Hamilton-Jacobi equations exactly for $H(\phi)$ and numerically calculate the COBE normalization to find

$$\Omega_g h^2 = \begin{cases} 2.3 \times 10^{-16} & \text{for } p \simeq 100, \\ 4.3 \times 10^{-18} & \text{for } p \simeq 10. \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

In conclusion, both abstract and particular models indicate a reasonable expectation that beam-in-space experiments can see the stochastic gravitational wave background, particularly if the present Hubble constant proves to be low. Predictions are however generically below $\Omega_g = 10^{-15}$ even for $h = 0.5$, indicating that the full anticipated sensitivity will be required. Counter-intuitively, the larger the gravitational wave signal in the microwave background, the smaller the expected signal for the beam-in-space experiment.

The author is supported by the SERC, and acknowledges the use of the Starlink computer system at the University of Sussex. I am grateful to Jim Hough for a conversation prompting me to look at this question, and to John Barrow, Alfredo Henriques, Gordon Moorhouse and David Wands for discussions.

References

- [1] G. F. Smoot *et al*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **396**, L1 (1992).
- [2] R. L. Davis *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 1856 (1992); (E) **70**, 1733 (1993). D. S. Salopek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 3602 (1992). A. R. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, *Phys. Lett.* **B291**, 391 (1992). F. Lucchin, S. Matarrese and S. Mollerach, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **401**, 49 (1992). J. E. Lidsey and P. Coles, *Mon. Not. R. astr. Soc.* **258**, 57p (1992).
- [3] A. H. Guth, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981). E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, *The Early Universe*, Addison-Wesley (1990).

- [4] A. R. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, “The Cold Dark Matter Density Perturbation”, to appear, Phys. Rep. (1993).
- [5] R. Crittenden *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 324 (1993).
- [6] A. R. Liddle, “The Inflationary Energy Scale”, Sussex preprint SUSSEX-AST 93/7-2 (1993).
- [7] N. Christensen, Phys. Rev. D**46**, 5250 (1992).
- [8] K. S. Thorne in *300 Years of Gravitation*, eds S. W. Hawking and W. Israel, Cambridge Univ. Press (1988).
- [9] T. Souradeep and V. Sahni, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A7**, 3541 (1992).
- [10] L. M. Krauss and M. White, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 869 (1992). M. White, Phys. Rev. D**46**, 4198 (1992).
- [11] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **B129**, 177 (1983); *Particle Physics and Inflationary Cosmology*, Gordon and Breach (1990).
- [12] D. S. Salopek and J. R. Bond, Phys. Rev. D**42**, 3936 (1990).
- [13] L. P. Grishchuk, Sov. Phys. JETP **40**, 409 (1975).
- [14] L. F. Abbott and M. B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B244**, 541 (1984). B. Allen, Phys. Rev. D**37**, 2078 (1988). V. Sahni, Phys. Rev. D**42**, 453 (1990).
- [15] K. Freese, J. A. Frieman and A. V. Olinto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3233 (1990).
- [16] F. Lucchin and S. Matarrese, Phys. Rev. D**32**, 1316 (1985).
- [17] D. La and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 376 (1989).
- [18] J. D. Barrow and A. R. Liddle, Phys. Rev. D**47**, R5219 (1993).
- [19] A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **B259**, 38 (1991); “Hybrid Inflation”, Stanford preprint SU-ITP-93-17 (1993).